

-6-

REMARKS

With the entry of the present Amendment, Claims 6-20 and 24-27 are pending in this application. In the Office Action dated November 4, 2003, Claims 6-8, 11-17 and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Podney (5,675,252). Claims 9-10 and 18 were objected to as being dependent on rejected a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated that these claims were otherwise allowable.

Applicants have amended Claims 12, 14, and 16, as suggested by the Examiner, to correct the informalities regarding antecedent basis. Claims 21 and 23, drawn to a non-elected invention, have been cancelled.

Applicants have amended independent Claim 8 to incorporate the subject matter of previously-allowable Claims 9 and 10. Specifically, Claim 8 now recites that the magnetic field sensor comprises "a multilayer structure having a single layer of a first one of the magnetostrictive and piezoelectric material, and two layers of the second one of the magnetostrictive and piezoelectric materials positioned so that the single layer of the first material lies between the two layers of the second material." Accordingly, it is believed that Claim 8 and its dependents, Claims 6-7, 9-13, 20, and 24-26 are all allowable.

Claim 14 has been rewritten in independent form, and now recites a magnetic field sensor comprising, *inter alia*, "a magnetostrictive material substrate and a plurality of piezoelectric stripes on a surface of the substrate." It is believed that Claim 14 is allowable, since the cited Podney patent relates to "composite structures" having numerous "interleaved layers" of magnetostrictive and piezoelectric elements bonded together in "stacks." There is no teaching or suggestion in any of the prior art of a magnetic field sensor which comprises a magnetostrictive substrate having a plurality of piezoelectric stripes, as recited in Claim 18. The present inventors have discovered that a magnetic sensor structure comprising a magnetostrictive substrate with piezoelectric stripes lends itself to thin-film processing techniques, and furthermore has the advantage of a high length-to-area ratio to give a small capacitance and provide high-frequency operation. As this magnetic field sensor is not taught or suggested in the art, it is believed that Claim 14 and its dependents, Claims 15-19 and 27, are all allowable.

-7-

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Kevin T. Shaughnessy
Kevin T. Shaughnessy
Registration No. 51,014
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 5/4/04